

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

---

Sarprio Doranti,

Civ. No. 22-1964 (JWB/DTS)

Plaintiff,

v.

Terry Kniesel, Ann Linkert, Cory  
Vargason, Kristi Wagner, Tammy  
Shelton, Beth Anderson, Michael  
Zimmerman, Sabrina Search, Thane  
Murphy, Frank Sansone, Rachel  
Broadway, Steve Sajdak, David Miles,  
and Benjamin Zuk, *in their individual and  
official capacities*,

**ORDER ACCEPTING  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Defendants.

---

Sarprio Doranti, 1111 Hwy 73, Moose Lake, MN 55767, pro se Petitioner.

Joao C.J.G. De Medeiros, Esq., Office of the Minnesota Attorney General, counsel for  
Defendants.

---

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) by  
United States Magistrate Judge David T. Schultz dated August 4, 2023. (Doc. No. 58.)  
Plaintiff has filed an objection to the recommendation that this Court dismiss his  
Amended Complaint without prejudice. (Doc. No. 60.)

The Court reviews the portions of the R&R to which Plaintiff objects *de novo* and  
“may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations  
made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Minn. LR 72.2(b)(3). When a  
party fails to file specific objections to an R&R, *de novo* review is not required. *See*

*Montgomery v. Compass Airlines, LLC*, 98 F. Supp. 3d 1012, 1017 (D. Minn. 2015) (observing that objections to an R&R that “are not specific but merely repeat arguments presented to and considered by a magistrate judge are not entitled to *de novo* review, but rather are reviewed for clear error”). The Court reviews any aspect of an R&R to which no specific objection is made for clear error. *Grinder v. Gammon*, 73 F.3d 793, 795 (8th Cir. 1996); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee’s note to 1983 amendment (“When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”). Because Plaintiff is *pro se*, his objections are entitled to liberal construction. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s objections to the August 4, 2023 R&R. Plaintiff’s objections do not identify any error of law or fact that warrant rejecting the recommendations in the R&R. And, after carefully reviewing all other portions of the R&R not specifically objected to, the Court finds that it is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. Based on that review, and in consideration of the applicable law, the Court accepts the R&R in its entirety.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiff’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 60) are **OVERRULED**;
2. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 58) is **ACCEPTED**;
3. Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 35) is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 10) is **DISMISSED WITHOUT**

**PREJUDICE.**

4. Plaintiff's Motion of his Proven Evidence and not to Dismiss his Complaint (Doc. No. 44) is **DENIED**.

5. Plaintiff's Motion to Move his Civil Suit Forward and not to Dismiss (Doc. No. 54) is **DENIED**.

6. Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. No. 21) is **DENIED**.

7. Plaintiff's Motion for Production of Documents (Doc. No. 41) is **DENIED**.

**LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.**

Date: September 11, 2023

*s/ Jerry W. Blackwell*  
JERRY W. BLACKWELL  
United States District Judge